but that he would not allow his religion to separate him from his fellow-Indians.[1] True religion which can make men integrated individuals, above chicanery and free from self-seeking is an asset to politics, but Nehru is right when he says that political religion is reactionary and mediaeval. One may refer to the disastrous character or fate of "Christian" or "Catholic" parties in Germany, Italy and Austria.

Nehru also points out that historically Hindus and Muslims have lived at peace with one another and in the villages do so generally still. Communal riots are an urban not a rural phenomenon for the most part. When there has been trouble in the villages it has generally been much more obviously economic. Muslim peasants attack a Hindu moneylender or *vice versa.* The famous Moplah Rising was almost purely economic in character. The failure to achieve a Congress Government in Bengal was to a great extent due to the fact that the Congress was largely middle class in character, or even of the landlord class, and neglected the poor Muslims. But, as Nehru says in *India and the World* (p. 187), "Hindus and Muslims do not form different races; they are essentially the same amalgam of races." Literacy and education will make a vast difference. Today cow-killing by Muslims and the playing of music outside mosques by Hindus are fruitful causes of trouble. Only a progressive change in social life can liquidate such fanaticism.

The Congress has said that "its primary duty and fundamental policy [is] to prgtect the religious, linguistic and cultural rights of the minorities in India so as to ensure for them in any scheme of government to which the Congress is party the widest scope for their development and participation

[1] There is all the difference in the world between a Christian Indian and an Indian Christian!